

REMARKS

Amendments to Claims

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims find support in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been introduced.

Drawings

Applicant has amended Figures 1-5 to include the designation “Prior Art,” as requested by Examiner. Replacement Figures 1-5 are presented. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the drawings are currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 3 and 7 stand objected to for the limitation “said second channels” lacking antecedent basis.

Claims 3 and 7 have been amended to read “said second channel,” as suggested by Examiner.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 3 and 7 are currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Examiner asserts that the limitation “doped so as to reduce capacitive coupling” renders the claim indefinite.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to clarify this limitation and particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 2 are currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by London (US 6,114,731).

Directing Examiner's attention to MPEP 2131, the threshold issue under Section 102 is whether the Examiner has established a *prima facie* case for anticipation. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.

Amended Claim 1 recites a transistor formed on a semiconductor substrate of a first conductivity type and comprising “a well formed in said substrate and doped with said first conductivity type to an impurity level higher than that of said substrate; a drain region doped to a second conductivity type opposite to said first conductivity type disposed in said well; a pair of opposed source regions doped to said second conductivity type disposed in said well and separated from opposing outer edges of said drain region by channel regions ... wherein the region of said well doped to an impurity level higher than that of said substrate overlaps said drain region, the overlap being about equal to the channel length of said transistor.”

Applicant cannot find, nor does Examiner cite, any mention in London of the region of the well doped to an impurity level higher than that of the substrate

overlapping the drain region, where the overlap is about equal to the channel length of the transistor, as recited in Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that London fails to disclose each and every element in as complete detail as in Claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The same arguments made above with respect to the patentability of Claim 1 are applicable to the patentability of Claim 2 as well. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 2 is currently in condition for allowance.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kumagai (US 6,329,693).

Applicant cannot find, nor does Examiner cite, any mention in Kumagai of the region of the well doped to an impurity level higher than that of the substrate overlapping the drain region, where the overlap is about equal to the channel length of the transistor, as recited in Claim 1.

Furthermore, the transistor of Claim 1 also comprises "... a region of said well disposed below said drain region doped to the same concentration as said substrate" Applicant cannot find, nor does Examiner cite, any mention in Kumagai of a region of the well disposed below the drain region being doped to the same concentration as the substrate, as recited in Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kumagai fails to disclose each and every element in as complete detail as in Claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The same arguments made above with respect to the patentability of Claim 1 are applicable to the patentability of Claim 2 as well. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 2 is currently in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over London in view of Rhee (US 6,395,941).

For a §103 obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. MPEP 2143.

Neither London nor Rhee discloses a transistor disposed on a p-type substrate “wherein the portion of said p-well doped to a higher concentration than said substrate overlaps said drain region, the overlap being about equal to the channel length of said transistor,” as recited in Claim 3. Since neither London nor Rhee teaches this limitation individually, they cannot teach it in combination.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner has failed to establish that all elements of the present invention are disclosed in the prior art. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 3 is currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Since Claim 4 depends from Claim 3, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 4 is also patentable as it contains the same limitations as its parent claim. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this application, the Examiner may telephone the undersigned at 775-586-9500.

Respectfully submitted,
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.



William P. Wilbar
Reg. No. 43,265

Dated: March 30, 2005

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.
P.O. Box 6149
Stateline, NV 89449
(775) 586-9500